



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,745

11/21/2003

Richard M. Edwards

300202

3145

7590 01/15/2009
Mark R. Kendrick
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
Suite 2800
725 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, MYLES D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,745

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ET AL.

Examiner

Myles D. Robinson

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 48 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 40 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 41 - 48 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 9/11/2008, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1 – 16, 23 – 28 and 30 – 48** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1 – 16, 23 – 28 and 30 – 41** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

3. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to Attorney Docket Number 81174-306117 is ineffective because such incorporation by reference must clearly identify the referenced patent, application or publication. See MPEP 608.01(p) and 37 CFR 1.57(b)(2).

Claim Objections

4. **Claim 30** is objected to because of the following informalities: typographical error. It is suggested that "to determine final print job medial selection parameters for the print job" be revised to read "to determine final print job ~~medial~~ media selection parameters for the print job." Appropriate correction is required.

5. The following quotation of 37 CFR 1.75(a) is the basis of the objection:

- (a) The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

6. **Claims 41 – 48** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

Claim 41 recites the limitation “a multi-media printer” in line 2 of the claim after the limitation “a multi-media printer” was claimed in line 1 of the claim. The applicant has failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim if the applicant is referring to **the same, instant** “multi-media printer” or **a unique and distinctly different** “multi-media printer” within the claim. All claims dependent upon this claim suffer the same deficiency and, therefore, are objected to as well.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
8. **Claims 5 – 9 and 36 – 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5 – 9 recite the limitation “the default media selection parameters.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There are two different “default media selection parameters” recited earlier in the parent claim 1: the “automatically utilized” parameters and the “overriding” parameters. It is unclear to

which of the parameters the limitation of claims 5 – 9, respectively, is referring to in their respective parent claim 1.

9. **Claim 36** recites the limitation "the print job media selection parameters" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. All claims dependent upon this claim suffer the same deficiency and, therefore, are rejected as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. **Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 23, 24 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Sesek** (U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611).

Referring to **claim 1**, Sesek discloses a method of configuring a multi-media printer, comprising:

receiving a print operation from a print client device (*see Fig. 2 wherein graphical user interface screen 70 displayed on monitor 34 of computer 20 [i.e. print client] allows the user to program a print job [column 3, line 46 – column 4, line 15]*), and

automatically utilizing default media selection parameters for the print operation if an overriding default media selection parameter is activated (see Fig. 3 wherein if *Printer Properties Retention* is enabled in step 92 and if the time has not expired in step 92, then user-preferred printer properties will override the default print settings [column 1, lines 7 – 11, column 2, lines 51 – 57, column 4, line 16 – column 5, line 3] and see column 1, lines 33 – 43 and column 2, lines 30 – 36 wherein printer properties are analogous to media selection parameters, such as different media types [e.g. transparencies, labels] stored in various trays and different media sizes), wherein the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable (see Fig. 2, *Printer Options Retention* 80 [column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 4]).

Referring to **claim 2**, Sesek discloses the method further wherein the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable via the print client device (see Fig. 1, computer 20 [column 3, lines 16 – 19]).

Referring to **claim 4**, Sesek discloses the method further wherein the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable via a presence of a configuration memory by the multi-media printer (see Fig. 1, memory 24, secondary storage 30, external storage 32 [column 3, lines 19 – 23 and 35 – 45]).

Referring to **claim 5**, Sesek discloses the method further wherein the default media selection parameters are a single default set of settings applied to all print operations (column 4, lines 48 – 51 wherein overriding default printer properties and be applied as “quick sets,” groups, or predefined multiple driver property combinations).

Referring to **claim 9**, Sesek discloses the method further wherein the default media selection parameters are selected based on a modality of the print operation (see *Figs. 2 and 3 wherein temporary print properties only override stored defaults in step 90 only if Printer Options Retention Enable 86 is checked and enabled [column 4, lines 7 – 13 and 37 – 55]*).

Referring to **claims 23, 24 and 26**, the rationale provided above in rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4, respectively, are incorporated herein. The methods of claims 1, 2 and 4 are stored as programs of instructions of claims 23, 24 and 26, respectively, within memory and executed by one or more processors (*see Fig. 1 wherein “modules” are stored within memory 24, secondary storage 30, external storage 32 and/or software 33 and executed by processor 22 [column 3, lines 19 – 23 and 35 – 45]*).

12. **Claims 10, 11, 27, 28, 30 and 32 – 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571).

Referring to **claim 30**, Rosekrans discloses a multi-media printer, comprising:
a decoding module (*see Figs. 1, 2 and 6, server 25*) to receive print job parameters and print job data for a print job (*see Fig. 2 wherein each print job consists of the print job, referred to as electronic document 45, and a job ticket 35 which contains programming parameters for the job entered via user interface 16 [column 3, lines 15 – 25 and 29 – 37]*), to decode the print job parameters and the print job data to create decoded print job parameters including decoded print job media selection parameters (*see Figs. 1, 2, 5 and 6 wherein user interface 16 provides user with a large selection of*

print stock size, type and color [i.e. print media selections] [column 4, lines 44 – 52]) and decoded print job data, and to output the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data (see Figs. 1, 2 and 6 wherein a processor in server 25 processes the electronic documents 45 for printing, or outputting, by the selected printer [column 2, lines 63 – 68 and column 4, lines 20 – 37]),

a configuration memory to store default configuration parameters (see Figs. 6 – 8 wherein printer UI mask 55 stores print default selections based upon printer configuration file 52 and family mask 50 [column 5, lines 30 – 40 and column 6, lines 25 – 30]), and

a parameter determination module to receive the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data (see Figs. 6 and 8 wherein substitution process 62 receives user-selected print parameters from job ticket 35-2 [column 5, lines 61 – 66, column 6, lines 1 – 4 and 9 – 30]), to receive the default configuration parameters including default media selection parameters from the configuration memory (column 6, lines 28 – 30), and to determine final print job media selection parameters for the print job utilizing the decoded print job media selection parameters and the default media selection parameters (see Figs. 6 – 8 wherein substitution process 62 determines final operational printing options available by substituting user-selected print settings with acceptable default print settings for that particular printer 12 [column 2, lines 57 – 62, column 6, lines 9 – 30 and 52 – 62]).

Referring to **claim 32**, Rosekrans discloses the apparatus further wherein the parameter determination module identifies that the decoded print job media selection parameters are not operational to establish media selection parameters (*column 6, lines 52 – 62*) and the default media selection parameters are selected as the final media selection parameters for the print job (*column 6, lines 9 – 30*).

Referring to **claims 33 and 34**, Rosekrans discloses the apparatus further wherein the parameter determination module identifies that the decoded print job media selection parameters are partially operational (*see Fig. 8 wherein substitution process 62 identifies both user-selected print media size and type in job ticket 35-2*), utilizes the default configuration media selection parameters to supplement the decoded print job media selection parameters to create the final media selection parameters (*see Fig. 8 wherein substitution process 62 determines final operational print options available by supplementing the combination of print settings, either the user-selected print media size and/or print media type, with acceptable default print settings for that particular printer 12 [column 2, lines 57 – 62 and column 6, lines 9 – 30]*), verifies that a combination of the default configuration media selection parameters and the decoded print job media selection parameters are operational (*see Fig. 7, validation 64 [column 6, lines 42 – 52]*), and if the combination of the default configuration media selection parameters and the decoded print job media selection parameters are not operational (*column 6, lines 52 – 62*), utilizes the default configuration media selection parameters as the final media selection parameters (*column 6, lines 9 – 30*).

Referring to **claim 10**, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated herein. In addition, the apparatus of claim 30 performs the method of claim 10. Furthermore, Rosekrans discloses wherein the media selection parameters include media type and media size (see *Fig. 8*) and wherein default media selection parameter is programmable (see *Figs. 6 – 8 wherein printer UI mask 55 stores print default selections based upon printer configuration file 52 and family mask 50 [column 5, lines 30 – 40 and column 6, lines 25 – 30]*).

Referring to **claim 11**, Rosekrans discloses the method further including combining an operational media selection parameter with the default media selection parameter and determining if the combining of the operational media selection parameter with the default media selection parameter is supported (see *Fig. 8 wherein substitution process 62 determines final operational print options available by supplementing the combination of print settings, either the user-selected print media size and/or print media type, with acceptable default print settings for that particular printer 12 [column 2, lines 57 – 62 and column 6, lines 9 – 30]*).

Referring to **claims 27 and 28**, the rationale provided above in rejections of claims 10 and 11, respectively, are incorporated herein. The methods of claims 10 and 11 are stored as programs of instructions of claims 27 and 28, respectively, within memory and executed by one or more processors (see *Fig. 1 wherein clients 15-1 – 15-N utilize PC client software within system 10 [column 3, lines 11 – 28] and see Fig. 2 wherein server 25 comprises server processor [column 4, lines 36 – 37]*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. **Claims 3 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sesek** (U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611) in view of **Bunker** (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,398).

Referring to **claim 3**, Sesek discloses the method as discussed in the rejection above but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable via an operation panel of the multi-media printer.

Bunker discloses the method wherein the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable via an operation panel of the multi-media printer (*see Fig. 1, display panel 110 [column 7, lines 11 – 17]*).

Sesek and Bunker are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being printing systems with default override mechanisms. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include locally providing override defaults at the printer. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently to allow the user to walk up and then set print settings at the printer.

Referring to **claim 25**, the rationale provided above in rejection of claim 3 is incorporated herein. The method of claim 3 is stored as a program of instructions of claim 25 within memory and executed by one or more processors (*see Fig. 1 wherein "modules" are stored within memory 24, secondary storage 30, external storage 32*

and/or software 33 and executed by processor 22 [column 3, lines 19 – 23 and 35 – 45]).

15. **Claims 6 – 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sesek** (U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611) in view of **Simpson et al.** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0011801).

Referring to **claim 6**, Sesek discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the default media selection parameters include a set of grayscale default settings and a set of color default settings.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (see *Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*) include a set of grayscale default settings and a set of color default settings (*paragraph 0043 wherein monochrome is analogous to a grayscale setting*).

Sesek and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

Referring to **claim 7**, Sesek discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the default media selection parameters include default settings based on a number of images printed on a single sheet as specified in the print operation.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (*see Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*) include default settings based on a number of images printed on a single sheet as specified in the print operation (*see Fig. 3 wherein, for example, selector 248 changes the copy count to 2 whenever the document name ends with "JPG and the length set is one page because at least 50% of the time, according to the user print history 252, the*

user requests two copies of a document one page in length and ending in "JPG" [paragraph 0047]).

Sesek and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

Referring to **claim 8**, Sesek discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the default media selection parameters include default settings selected based on a size of a source image as specified in the print operation.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (*see Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*)

include default settings selected based on a size of a source image as specified in the print operation (*paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. automatic conversion of document to the size of paper in the printer] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives and see paragraphs 0042 and 0047 wherein a particular rule may map any print request for an image greater than a particular size to certain print option configuration*).

Sesek and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

16. **Claims 13 – 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571) in view of **Simpson et al.** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0011801).

Referring to **claim 13**, Rosekrans discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the

default media selection parameters include a set of grayscale default settings and a set of color default settings.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (see *Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047]* and see *paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*) include a set of grayscale default settings and a set of color default settings (*paragraph 0043 wherein monochrome is analogous to a grayscale setting*).

Rosekrans and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

Referring to **claim 14**, Rosekrans discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the

default media selection parameters include default settings based on a number of images printed on a single sheet as specified in the print operation.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (see Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives) include default settings based on a number of images printed on a single sheet as specified in the print operation (see Fig. 3 wherein, for example, selector 248 changes the copy count to 2 whenever the document name ends with "JPG and the length set is one page because at least 50% of the time, according to the user print history 252, the user requests two copies of a document one page in length and ending in "JPG" [paragraph 0047]).

Rosekrans and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more

characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

Referring to **claim 15**, Rosekrans discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the default media selection parameters include default settings selected based on a size of a source image as specified in the print operation.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (*see Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*) include default settings selected based on a size of a source image as specified in the print operation (*paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. automatic conversion of document to the size of paper in the printer] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives and see paragraphs 0042 and 0047 wherein a particular rule may map any print request for an image greater than a particular size to certain print option configuration*).

Rosekrans and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

Referring to **claim 16**, Rosekrans discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the default media selection parameters include default settings selected based on a modality of the print operation.

Simpson discloses the method wherein the default media selection parameters (*see Fig. 3 wherein print option selector 248 is comprised within printer 224 and begins with a default set of print options for a print request and then overrides individual settings in the default set based upon history 252 and rules 250 [paragraphs 0041, 0042 and 0045 – 0047] and see paragraph 0021 wherein each print option [e.g. a particular print media source from a loaded input tray, which is analogous to a media selection] used to configure a printer affects how the printer will print documents it receives*) include default settings selected based on a modality of the print operation (*see paragraph 0021 wherein print options include a print quality of the document [e.g. photo, draft, text, etc.], whether or not to watermark the printed image, simplex/duplex printing, collation of the document, automatic conversion of document to the size of paper [e.g. auto print-to-fit media mode] and various other finishing operations [e.g. stapling,*

binding, cutting], which all are different printer modes [modalities] in which the printer executes a print request).

Rosekrans and Simpson are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer based upon specific, user-defined print job requirements. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing certain default parameters to be overridden. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve the user's ability to configure printers in a user-friendly manner such that one or more print options to be used in a print request are automatically selected based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, as suggested by Simpson (*paragraphs 0004, 0007, 0021 and 0060*).

17. **Claims 12 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571) in view of **Sesek** (U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611).

Referring to **claim 12**, Rosekrans discloses the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 10 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the potential default media selection parameters are a single set of settings applied to all print operations.

Sesek discloses the method further wherein the default media selection parameters are a single default set of settings applied to all print operations (*column 4, lines 48 – 51 wherein overriding default printer properties and be applied as "quick*

sets," groups, or predefined multiple driver property combinations for a particular period of time).

Rosekrans and Sesek are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer that facilitates the determination of proper print modes. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include applying a single set of settings to all print operations. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to ensure certain, expected print results in a quick, convenient fashion to a plurality of printer properties as the name "quick sets" suggests, as suggested by Sesek (*column 4, lines 7 – 11, 48 – 51 and column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 3*).

Referring to **claim 31**, Rosekrans discloses the apparatus as discussed above in the rejection of claim 30 but does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further wherein an always use default setting is established and the parameter determination module selects the default media selection parameters as the final media selection parameters.

Sesek discloses the apparatus wherein an always use default setting is established and the parameter determination module selects the default media selection parameters as the final media selection parameters (*see Fig. 3 wherein the "always use" default option when either the user chooses not to activate the Printer Options Retention Enable button 86 and always print using default values in steps 90 – 91 [column 2, lines 51 – 57, column 4, lines 11 – 15 and 34 – 36] or when the retention time period has expired and printer properties revert to always use their default values*

indefinitely hereinafter in steps 92, 98 – 99 [column 1, lines 7 – 11, column 2, lines 54 – 57, column 4, lines 7 – 11 and 45 – 48]).

Rosekrans and Seseek are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer that facilitates the determination of proper print modes. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing the user to toggle between always using default print settings or when to override those default values. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently give the user discretion over when to always use conventional default settings and when to revert to those same conventional default settings after a temporary time period always hereinafter, as suggested by Seseek (*column 1, lines 7 – 11, column 2, lines 30 – 44, 51 – 57 and column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 3*).

18. **Claim 35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571).

Referring to **claim 35**, Rosekrans discloses the apparatus as discussed above in the rejection of claim 30 but does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further wherein the configuration memory is a non-volatile memory.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that memory which is non-volatile is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure the default print configurations will still ready and available upon

booting the system since the Examiner takes Official Notice that loading default system configuration settings from a non-volatile memory is well known in the art.

19. **Claims 36, 38 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571) in view of **Ozaki** (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,061).

Referring to **claim 36**, Rosekrans discloses a system, comprising:

a plurality of computing devices (*see Fig. 1, clients 15-1 – 15-N [column 3, lines 11 – 37]*) to transmit print jobs including print job parameters and print job data (*see Fig. 2 wherein each print job consists of the print job, referred to as electronic document 45, and a job ticket 35 which contains programming parameters for the job entered via user interface 16 [column 3, lines 15 – 25 and 29 – 37]*),

a printer (*see Fig. 1, printers 12-1 – 12-N*) to receive the print jobs from the plurality of computing devices and to create an image from the print job data according to the print job parameters (*column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 10*),

a decoding module (*see Figs. 1, 2 and 6, server 25*) to receive print job parameters and print job data for a print job (*see Fig. 2 wherein each print job consists of the print job, referred to as electronic document 45, and a job ticket 35 which contains programming parameters for the job entered via user interface 16 [column 3, lines 15 – 25 and 29 – 37]*), to decode the print job parameters and the print job data to create decoded print job parameters including decoded print job media selection parameters (*see Figs. 1, 2, 5 and 6 wherein user interface 16 provides user with a large selection of*

print stock size, type and color [i.e. print media selections] [column 4, lines 44 – 52]) and decoded print job data, and to output the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data (see Figs. 1, 2 and 6 wherein a processor in server 25 processes the electronic documents 45 for printing, or outputting, by the selected printer [column 2, lines 63 – 68 and column 4, lines 20 – 37]),

a configuration memory to store default configuration parameters (see Figs. 6 – 8 wherein printer UI mask 55 stores print default selections based upon printer configuration file 52 and family mask 50 [column 5, lines 30 – 40 and column 6, lines 25 – 30]), and

a parameter determination module to receive the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data (see Figs. 6 and 8 wherein substitution process 62 receives user-selected print parameters from job ticket 35-2 [column 5, lines 61 – 66, column 6, lines 1 – 4 and 9 – 30]), to receive the default configuration parameters including default media selection parameters from the configuration memory (column 6, lines 28 – 30), and to determine final print job media selection parameters for the print job utilizing the decoded print job media selection parameters and the default media selection parameters (see Figs. 6 – 8 wherein substitution process 62 determines final operational printing options available by substituting user-selected print settings with acceptable default print settings for that particular printer 12 [column 2, lines 57 – 62, column 6, lines 9 – 30 and 52 – 62]) but does not explicitly disclose a multi-media printer included within a medical imaging

system, comprising a plurality of computing devices to transmit print jobs including print job parameters and print job data, a plurality of medical imaging devices to transmit print jobs including print job parameters and print job data, and a multi-media printer to receive the print jobs from either the plurality of computing devices or the plurality of medical imaging devices and to create an image from the print job data according to the print job parameters.

Ozaki discloses the multi-media printer (*see Fig. 1, printers 201, 202 [column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 15]*) included within a medical imaging system (*see Fig. 1, network system 100 [Abstract and column 5, lines 27– 42]*), wherein the system comprising:

a plurality of computing devices (*see Fig. 1, workstations 10A, 10B*) to transmit print jobs including print job parameters and print job data (*column 6, lines 41 – 50 wherein it is well-known in the art that workstations 10A, 10B submit print jobs via a network [e.g. LAN, WAN] to printers 201, 202*),

a plurality of medical imaging devices (*see Fig. 1, medical modalities 50A – 50F*) to transmit print jobs including print job parameters and print job data (*column 5, lines 49 – 54*), and

the multi-media printer to receive the print jobs from either the plurality of computing devices or the plurality of medical imaging devices and to create an image from the print job data according to the print job parameters (*column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 40*).

Rosekrans and Ozaki are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being networked printing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect several different medical imaging devices to a multi-media printer. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to print acquired images from medical imaging devices at various sizes, as suggested by Ozaki (*column 1, lines 17 – 25 and column 6, lines 1 – 15*).

Referring to **claims 38 and 39**, the rationale provided above in the rejections of claims 32 and 33, respectively, are incorporated herein. In addition, the apparatus of claims 32 and 33 include the limitations and elements of the system of claims 38 and 39, respectively.

20. **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571) in view of **Ozaki** (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,061) and further in view of **Sesek** (U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611).

Referring to **claim 37**, Rosekrans and Ozaki disclose the apparatus as discussed above in the rejection of claim 36 but does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further wherein an always use default setting is established and the parameter determination module selects the default media selection parameters as the final media selection parameters.

Sesek discloses the apparatus wherein an always use default setting is established and the parameter determination module selects the default media selection parameters as the final media selection parameters and the default media selection

parameters are utilized to produce the image along with the decoded print data (see Fig. 3 wherein the “always use” default option when either the user chooses not to activate the Printer Options Retention Enable button 86 and always print using default values in steps 90 – 91 [column 2, lines 51 – 57, column 4, lines 11 – 15 and 34 – 36] or when the retention time period has expired and printer properties revert to always use their default values indefinitely hereinafter in steps 92, 98 – 99 [column 1, lines 7 – 11, column 2, lines 54 – 57, column 4, lines 7 – 11 and 45 – 48]).

Rosekrans and Sesek are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being print option configuration of a printer that facilitates the determination of proper print modes. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include allowing the user to toggle between always using default print settings or when to override those default values. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently give the user discretion over when to always use conventional default settings and when to revert to those same conventional default settings after a temporary time period always hereinafter, as suggested by Sesek (column 1, lines 7 – 11, column 2, lines 30 – 44, 51 – 57 and column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 3).

21. **Claim 40** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rosekrans et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571) in view of **Ozaki** (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,061).

Referring to **claim 40**, Rosekrans and Ozaki disclose the system as discussed above in the rejection of claim 36 but does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further wherein the configuration memory is a non-volatile memory.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that memory which is non-volatile is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure the default print configurations will still ready and available upon booting the system since the Examiner takes Official Notice that loading default system configuration settings from a non-volatile memory is well known in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

22. **Claims 41 – 48** are have been objected to.

Referring to **claim 41**, the innovative limitation that distinguishes the Applicant's claim is a multi-media printer that utilizes two printing technologies.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myles D. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-5944. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Myles D. Robinson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
1/6/09

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625